

The Term • Conspiracy Theorist

Dylan Eleven

Aug 12, 2023 2 min

DISPATCH		CLASSIFICATION	PROCESSING ACTION
Chiefs, Certain Stations and Bureaus			X NO RECORD REQUIRED
Document Number: 1035-960			
Chiefs, MOBILE For FOIA Review on SEP 1976			
CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM Released in Full 1980			
<p>Counterintelligence Criticism of the Warren Report</p> <p>PAUL H. PATTON This was a major factor in the Warren Commission's decision to release the Warren Report. The Warren Commission's decision to release the Warren Report was a major factor in the Warren Commission's decision to release the Warren Report. The Warren Commission's decision to release the Warren Report was a major factor in the Warren Commission's decision to release the Warren Report.</p> <p>1. Our Concern. From the day of President Kennedy's assassination on, 11/22/63, there has been speculation about the responsibility for his murder. Although this was stemmed for a time by the Warren Commission report (which appeared at the end of September 1964), various writers have now had time to scan the Commission's published report and documents for new pretenses for questioning, and there has been a new wave of books and articles criticising the Commission's findings. In most cases the critics have speculated as to the existence of some kind of conspiracy, and often they have implied that the Commission itself was involved. Presumably as a result of the increasing challenge to the Warren Commission's Report, a public opinion poll recently indicated that 46% of the American public did not think that Oswald acted alone, while more than half of those polled thought that the Commission had left some questions unresolved. Doubtless polls abroad would show similar, or possibly more adverse, results.</p> <p>2. This trend of opinion is a matter of concern to the U.S. government, including our organization. The members of the Warren Commission were naturally chosen for their integrity, experience, and prominence. They represented both major parties, and they and their staff were deliberately drawn from all sections of the country. Just because of the standing of the Commissioners, efforts to impugn their rectitude and wisdom tend to cast doubt on the whole leadership of American society. Moreover, there seems to be an increasing tendency to hint that President Johnson himself, as the one person who might be said to have benefited, was in some way responsible for the assassination. Innumerable of such seriousness affects not only the individual concerned, but also the whole reputation of the American government. Our organization itself is directly involved: among other facts, we contributed information to the investigation. Conspiracy theories have frequently thrown suspicion on our organization, for example by falsely alleging that Lee Harvey Oswald worked for us. The aim of this dispatch is to provide material for countering and discrediting the claims of the conspiracy theorists, so as to inhibit the circulation of such claims in other countries. Background information is supplied in a classified section and in a number of unclassified attachments.</p> <p>3. Action. We do not recommend that discussion of the assassination question be initiated where it is not already taking place. Where discussion is initiated, however, advice is requested:</p> <p>1 - SECRET 2 - Unclassified</p> <p>7 attachments</p> <p>CS COPY NO 5047 DATE 2-1-299248</p> <p>NO FILE NUMBER DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER NEEDED</p>			

CONTINUATION OF DISPATCH		CLASSIFICATION	PROCESSING ACTION
a. To discuss the publicity problem with liaison and friendly elite contacts (especially politicians and editors), pointing out that the Warren Commission made no attempt at investigation as usually possible, that the charges of the critics are without serious foundation, and that further speculative discussion only plays into the hands of the opposition. Point out also that parts of the conspiracy talk appear to be deliberately generated by Communist propagandists. Use this to use their influence to discourage unfounded and irresponsible speculation.			
b. To employ propaganda assets to answer and refute the attacks of the critics. Book reviews and feature articles are particularly appropriate for this purpose. The unclassified attachments to this guidance should provide useful background material for passages to assets. One plan should point out, as applicable, that the critics are (i) misled to theories shaped before the evidence was in, (ii) politically interested, (iii) financially interested, (iv) badly and inaccurately in their research, or (v) infatuated with their own theories. In the course of disseminating the whole phenomenon of criticism, a useful strategy may be to single out Epstein's theory for attack, using the attached Fletcher Knebel article and Spectator piece for background. (Although Warren Lee's book is much less convincing than Epstein's and comes off badly where countered by knowledgeable critics, it is also much more difficult to answer as a whole, as one becomes lost in a mass of unrelated details.)			
c. In private or media discussion not directed at any particular writer, or in attacking publications which may be yet forthcoming, the following arguments should be useful:			
<p>a. No significant new evidence has emerged which the Commission did not consider. The assassination is sometimes compared (e.g., by Jeanette Johnston and Bernard Russell) with the Dreyfus case; however, unlike that case, the attacks on the Warren Commission have produced no new evidence, no new insights have been convincingly identified, and there is no agreement among the critics. (It better parallel, though an imperfect one, might be with the Huchings Five of 1932, which some competent historians (Fritz Tobias, A.J.F. Taylor, B.C. Watt) believe was set by the day after his on initiative, without asking for either Nazis or Communists, the Nazis tried to pin the blame on the Communists, but the latter have been much more successful in convincing the world that the Nazis were to blame.)</p> <p>b. Critics usually overstate particular items and ignore others. They tend to place more emphasis on the individual's experience, which are less reliable and more divergent -- and hence offer more handholds for criticism and less on ballistic, autopsy, and photographic evidence. A close examination of the Commission's records will usually show that the conflicting eyewitness accounts are sorted out of context, or were discarded by the Commission for good and sufficient reasons.</p> <p>c. Conspiracy on the large scale often suggested would be impossible to conceal in the United States, esp. since informants could expect to receive large rewards, etc. Note that Robert Kennedy, Attorney General at the time and John F. Kennedy's brother, would be the last man to overlook or conceal any conspiracy. And as one reviewer pointed out, Congressman Gerald P. Ford would hardly have said his tongue for the sake of the Democratic administration, and Senator Russell would have had every political interest in exposing any misdeeds on the part of Chief Justice Warren. A conspirator moreover would hardly choose a location for a shooting where so much depended on conditions beyond his control: the route, the speed of the cars, the seating target, the risk that the assassin would be discovered. A group of wealthy conspirators could have arranged such more secure conditions.</p> <p>d. Critics have often been enticed by a form of intellectual pride: they light on some theory and fall in love with it; they also scoff at the Commission because it did not always answer every question with a flat decision one way or the other. Actually, the make-up of the Commission and its staff was an excellent background-applied over-commitment to any one theory, or against the illicit dissemination of probabilities into speculation.</p>			

Dylan Eleven • Truth11.com

The term conspiracy theorist was originally re-branded by the CIA from being a part of a process into an all encompassing term. A term that describes a person who has a theory of a conspiracy; but makes it seem that they cannot and will not ever be able to prove it.

Quite the feat of psychological warfare.

The psyop was very successful in creating a knee jerk manufactured response given by the sheep to anyone questioning the official narrative of the JFK assassination every event since.

Subscribe

The term conspiracy means:



The process:

- Before the event
- The event
- An analysis of the event and all information before and after the event.
- If the event narrative does not ring true, and people, actions and events suggest there may have been a prior arrangement to commit all steps in the event, past present and future. The **theory** is now establish there may be a **conspiracy** in place.
- Then you investigate to find evidence of the conspiracy.

See we have moved on already from the theory part, it is only a part of the process.

- Once evidence is found, the conspiracy has been proven. It is no longer a conspiracy theory, it is a conspiracy fact.

This next step is what the imagery psyop around the term conspiracy theorist suggests that we don't take. But we do.

Many think because they can brand us with the brush of conspiracy theorist that they don't have to acknowledge any proof we provide. An act of ignorance.

This is what the so called fact checkers have to say about my work on Truth11.com

Truth11 is a conspiracy and pseudoscience website that covers many unproven conspiracies, such as Covid vaccines being used to depopulate the world via a “global project to inject humanity with gene-altering death-dealing technology.” There is no evidence that Covid vaccines are designed to depopulate. Other examples are that radiation from 5G technology, not Covid, is killing people. None of these claims are backed by science. - **MediaBiasFactCheck**

Reality and proven truth backs up our reporting. Fact checking using a false narrative is simply labelling the truth a lie. Quite pathetic.

I am a journalist that focuses on the truth. The theory of a conspiracy is just a step in the process of finding out the truth. The majority of information reported on Truth11.com is way past the theory stage. Yet most assume its is all theory and no fact. They choose to remain ignorant of the truth to stay in their bubble, and use a pyop term coined in the 70's as their justification.

DISPATCH

CLASSIFICATION
~~SECRET~~

PROCESSING ACTION
MARKED FOR INDEXING

TO
Chiefs, Certain Stations and Bases

INFO
Document Number 1035-960

FROM
Chief, WOVVIEW for FOIA Review on SEP 1976

SUBJECT
Counteracting Criticism of the Warren Report

1. Our Concern.

2. This trend of opinion is a matter of concern to the U.S. government, including our organization.

3. Action.

PAUL H. OSWALD
PSYCH

THIS WAS PULLED TOGETHER BY NED BENNETT OF CIA STAFF
INCLUDE IN CONNECTION WITH CTRIA...
OF THE SOURCE MATERIAL, PUBLISHED IN THE "NEW YORK TIMES"
AND PROVIDED GENERAL "EXPERTISE" IN THE CASE. THE
SUBJECT ARTICLE WAS WRITTEN BY BENNETT.

29 JAN 1967

CS COPY

201-289248

4/1/67

9 attachments h/w

1 - SECRET
8 - Unclassified

CLASSIFICATION
~~SECRET~~

DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER NEEDED

CONTINUATION OF DISPATCH

CLASSIFICATION
~~SECRET~~

DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NUMBER
ED 5847

a. To discuss the publicity problem with liaison and friendly elite contacts (especially politicians and editors), pointing out that the Warren Commission made as thorough an investigation as humanly possible, that the charges of the critics are without serious foundation, and that further speculative discussion only plays into the hands of the opposition. Point out also that parts of the conspiracy talk appear to be deliberately generated by Communist propagandists. Urge them to use their influence to discourage unfounded and irresponsible speculation.

b. To employ propaganda assets to answer and refute the attacks of the critics. Book reviews and feature articles are particularly appropriate for this purpose. The unclassified attachments to this guidance should provide useful background material for passage to assets. Our play should point out, as applicable, that the critics are (i) wedded to theories adopted before the evidence was in, (ii) politically interested, (iii) financially interested, (iv) hasty and inaccurate in their research, or (v) infatuated with their own theories. In the course of discussions of the whole phenomenon of criticism, a useful strategy may be to single out Epstein's theory for attack, using the attached Fletcher Knebel article and Spectator piece for background. (Although Mark Lane's book is much less convincing than Epstein's and comes off badly where contested by knowledgeable critics, it is also much more difficult to answer as a whole, as one becomes lost in a morass of unrelated details.)

4. In private or media discussion not directed at any particular writer, or in attacking publications which may be yet forthcoming, the following arguments should be useful:

a. No significant new evidence has emerged which the Commission did not consider. The assassination is sometimes compared (e.g., by Joachim Joesten and Bertrand Russell) with the Dreyfus case; however, unlike that case, the attacks on the Warren Commission have produced no new evidence, no new culprits have been convincingly identified, and there is no agreement among the critics. (A better parallel, though an imperfect one, might be with the Reichstag fire of 1933, which some competent historians (Fritz Tobias, A.J.P. Taylor, D.C. Watt) now believe was set by Van der Lubbe on his own initiative, without acting for either Nazis or Communists; the Nazis tried to pin the blame on the Communists, but the latter have been much more successful in convincing the world that the Nazis were to blame.)

b. Critics usually overvalue particular items and ignore others. They tend to place more emphasis on the recollections of individual eyewitnesses (which are less reliable and more divergent -- and hence offer more hand-holds for criticism) and less on ballistic, autopsy, and photographic evidence. A close examination of the Commission's records will usually show that the conflicting eyewitness accounts are quoted out of context, or were discarded by the Commission for good and sufficient reason.

c. Conspiracy on the large scale often suggested would be impossible to conceal in the United States, esp. since informants could expect to receive large royalties, etc. Note that Robert Kennedy, Attorney General at the time and John F. Kennedy's brother, would be the last man to overlook or conceal any conspiracy. And as one reviewer pointed out, Congressman Gerald R. Ford would hardly have held his tongue for the sake of the Democratic administration, and Senator Russell would have had every political interest in exposing any misdeeds on the part of Chief Justice Warren. A conspirator moreover would hardly choose a location for a shooting where so much depended on conditions beyond his control: the route, the speed of the cars, the moving target, the risk that the assassin would be discovered. A group of wealthy conspirators could have arranged much more secure conditions.

d. Critics have often been enticed by a form of intellectual pride: they light on some theory and fall in love with it; they also scoff at the Commission because it did not always answer every question with a flat decision one way or the other. Actually, the make-up of the Commission and its staff was an excellent safeguard against over-commitment to any one theory, or against the illicit transformation of probabilities into certainties.

FORM 53a

USE PREVIOUS EDITION.

CLASSIFICATION
~~SECRET~~

CONTINUED

PAGE NO.
TWO

Subscribe to Truth11.com

Receive Articles By Email

 **Subscribe now**

Support Truth11.com • Make A Donation

• Become A Subscriber

Armed With The Truth • United We Stand